Regional Historical Context

The following text about historic themes, contexts, and temporal periods, follows the *Delaware Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan* (1989) and the *Historic Context Master Reference and Summary* (1989). Unless otherwise cited, the information contained herein is derived primarily from the *Route 26 Historic Context* (2003), and applies as specifically as possible to the vicinity of Route 24 approximately from Love Creek to Route 1 in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred, Sussex County, Delaware.

Per the direction of DelDOT and the Delaware State Historic Preservation Office (DE SHPO), property types were derived for each time period (where applicable) along the Route 24 corridor from Love Creek to Route 1. Because a "property type is a grouping of individual properties based on shared physical or associative characteristics" which are linked by the "ideas incorporated in the theoretical historic context with actual historic properties that illustrate those ideas" physical characteristics and usage (along with the Regional Historical Context) helped inform the definition of property types for this report (De Cunzo & Garcia, p. 233).

Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred

Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred is located along the southeastern coast of Sussex County, Delaware. A part of the Coastal Zone and the Lower Peninsula/Cypress Swamp Zone as identified in the *Delaware Comprehensive Historic Plan,* Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred's history is tied to the natural features of the landscape. The hundred is bounded to the north by the Delaware Bay, to the south by the Indian River Bay and Indian River Hundred, to the east by the Atlantic Ocean, and to the west by Broadkiln Hundred. The Coastal Zone of Delaware ranks as one of the highest preservation priorities for the state of Delaware. Not only does this area contain some of the earliest settlements in the state, but it is also threatened by commercial and residential development resulting from tourism. The Lower Peninsula/Cypress Swamp Zone (Eastern) Zone ranks as the fourth priority for above-ground resource preservation as identified in the *Delaware Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan.*

Contact Period: A.D. 1650 – A.D. 1750 +/-

The Contact Period marks the initial arrival of European groups, predominately Dutch, Swedish, and English, to the Middle Atlantic region. Overall, data from the archaeological record of this time period is limited, and often, ethnographic accounts by these first European explorers and settlers have been considered important supplementary sources of information.

In Delaware, few sites with clear Contact Period components have been identified. Two of Delaware's more studied Contact Period sites, 7NC-E-42 (Custer and Watson 1986;

Custer 1989) and the Dragon Run Site (7NC-G-104: Kellogg et. al 1994), are located in New Castle County. By comparison, the European-manufactured artifact assemblages from both sites are considerably more meager than those recovered from contemporaneous Contact Period sites in neighboring Pennsylvania and Maryland (Custer 1989; Custer and Watson 1986; Kellogg et al. 1994). Additionally, the Native American assemblages strongly indicate a relatively undisturbed continuation of Woodland II Period lifestyles at 7NC-E-42 and the Dragon Run Site (7NC-G-104). The lack of participation between these Native American groups and Europeans has been attributed to a stronghold of southern Pennsylvania Susquehannock groups on the Delaware (Custer 1989; Custer and Silber 1994; Custer 1984).

Although several Contact Period-era European-made pipes and Native American artifacts recovered at the Townsend Site (7S-G-2) in southern Delaware have been attributed to a Contact Period occupation (Omwake and Stewart 1963), the association of the Native American and European artifact assemblages continues to be somewhat unclear (Custer 1984). Similar discoveries of European and Native American artifacts have also been noted at several Woodland II Slaughter Creek Complex sites; however, like the artifacts from the Townsend Site (7S-G-2), the exact contextual relationship between these artifacts also remains uncertain (Custer 1984).

Documentary materials provide some insight on interactions between Native American and European groups during the Contact Period in the Lewes & Rehoboth Hundred area. Historical accounts refer to a Native American settlement known as "Sironesack" (aka. Chenonnessex, Checonesseck, Sikonesses or Sickpnesys, and Sickonesyns) near Lewes (Weslager 1942a, 1942b, 1943; Kellogg, Catts and Wood 1999). Interestingly, written records of a 1629-1630 land transaction by the Dutch includes the names Quesquakous and Ensanques and both individuals are recorded as being inhabitants of Sickonesyns (Weslager 1948; Kellogg, Catts, and Wood 1999). It has also been suggested that the c. 1632 burning of portions of the early Dutch settlement of Lewes was a result of a misunderstanding between local inhabitants and the Dutch (Weslager 1968; Custer 1989).

Later land records suggest that during the last quarter of the seventeenth century, Assateague groups were living in the White Neck area (Catts, Custer, and Hawley 1992). As European groups continued to expand settlement in the area, many Assateagues moved westward. By the 1720s, Assateagues were living in the Millsboro area (Mayre 1939, 1940; Catts, Custer, and Hawley 1992).

Although Native American groups continued to live in the area, aside from some occasional exceptions, Woodland II Period Native American lifeways had been dramatically altered by the middle part of the eighteenth century.

The first recorded contact between the Nanticoke Tribe and Europeans took place in 1608 when Captain John Smith and his crew were exploring the Chesapeake Bay and Kuskarawaok River. According to Smith, nearly 200 warriors and their families lived on the Nanticoke River. The tribe was allied with the Powahatan Confederacy in Virginia. The Nanticokes' name derives from the word *Nantaquak* in Algonquian, meaning "*the*

tidewater people". The Nanticokes both hunted and farmed, planting and drying corn and beans, and lived in seasonal villages with groups of wigwams and larger long houses for council meetings and tribal gatherings (*25th Annual Nanticoke Powwow* 2002).

By the end of the seventeenth century, the Nanticoke and Choptank tribes were the only remaining native tribes inhabiting the eastern shore of Maryland. The tribes' traditional seasonal hunting and farming practices were disrupted by settlers and traders, and by the accompanying deforestation. Colonial authorities made some attempts to protect the tribes and facilitate coexistence; however, their suggestions were often ignored and in 1642 and 1647, "Maryland Governor Thomas Greene ordered Capt. John Pike of the militia, to attack and destroy the Nanticoke village and gardens to force them out of the area." A treaty was signed in 1668 by Chief Unnacokasimmon to establish peace with Maryland; it was the first of five treaties. However, the Nanticoke and Choptank eventually asked to be granted specific tracts of land by the Maryland authorities (*25th Annual Nanticoke Powwow* 2002).

Land was set aside by the Maryland Assembly in the early eighteenth century for three reservations, including three thousand acres for the Nanticoke on Broad Creek. The restriction of confinement to the reservation continued to disrupt seasonal hunting and restrict food and shelter. The tradition was to move from spring and summer farming and fishing sites inland to the winter hunting grounds, but a stipulation required that the Nanticoke agree not to leave the reservation lands in order to retain them. A petition to leave during winter months to hunt was granted, but squatters appeared on reservation land by the following spring (*25th Annual Nanticoke Powwow* 2002).

In 1742, Nanticoke leaders "met in Winnasoccum Swamp, near the Pocomoke River to plan for war." Maryland colonists and leaders were informed of the plan by a Choptank Indian and threatened to take the Nanticoke land. The Nanticoke, frustrated by years of conflict, "chose to accept an offer from the Six Nations of the Iroquois in the New York, Pennsylvania, and Canadian areas" promising land and protection. Some Nanticoke traveled north up the Susquehanna River and some walked westward, "but a significant number of Nanticoke moved eastward into Delaware and settled in Indian River Hundred, near the Indian River." This group of Nanticoke gradually assimilated into the predominant culture by the nineteenth century (*25th Annual Nanticoke Powwow* 2002).

Exploration and Frontier Settlement: 1630-1730 +/-

In 1631, the Dutch first established a settlement near the port of Lewes, Delaware. Dutch sea captain David Pietersen De Vries started this whaling community and named it Zwaanendael, meaning "Valley of the Swans" (Alotta, p. 287). Zwaanendael lasted until 1632, when De Vries left and Native Americans allegedly decimated the remaining Europeans in the colony (http://www.co.sussex.de.us/historical/index.html). Other small, scattered outposts of English, Scotch-Irish, and Dutch settlers were set up near coastal bays and river inlets during the seventeenth century.

The southern portion of what is now Sussex County was formerly called "Deale" in the late seventeenth century; the entire county was renamed Sussex in 1682 by William Penn. After disputes between William Penn and the Calverts of Maryland, the county border was finally established with the drawing of the Mason-Dixon Line in the mid-eighteenth century (Morin et al, p. 3.3).

In 1704, the three "lower" counties of Pennsylvania (New Castle, Kent, and Sussex Counties) separated to form the colony that would later become the State of Delaware. The newly formed colony of Delaware wanted greater independence from European control and accordingly established its own government, albeit under English rule.

Despite sandy, nutrient-poor soils in the Coastal Zone region, many early inhabitants engaged in corn farming (NSDAR, p. 7). Tobacco was a major crop, and livestock raising was also common. Dwellings and "plantations" were located generally on well-drained soil with a small agricultural field or fields close by; these plantations were spaced at distances ranging from 0.25 to 1.5 miles from each other. Domestic architecture was characterized by one- or two-story, one-room plan dwellings made of wood; agricultural outbuildings included structures related directly to the tobacco and grain economy such as frame tobacco sheds, small barns, or structures to house hogs and cattle (Custer & Catts, p. 33). More research needs to be conducted to determine the impact and extent of these early colonial efforts upon the architecture, settlement patterns, religious, and community organization of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred. There are no anticipated property types from the Period of Exploration and Frontier Settlement (1630-1730 +/-) along the Route 24 Love Creek to Route 1 Area of Potential Effect (APE) because many buildings were impermanent in nature, the area has suffered damaging weather events, and modern development has encroached along the shoreline.

The archaeological record may one day be able to provide insight into the everyday lifeways of the Exploration and Frontier Period of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred, Sussex County. Interestingly, a small handful of archaeological sites with occupations dating to this time period have been discovered in Sussex County (De Cunzo and Catts, 1990). Most of these sites are believed to be the remains of agricultural complexes. Currently, studies of these sites have been limited (e.g., 7S-E-94, 7S-G-23, 7S-G-82, 7S-G-107, 7S-D-11, 7S-D-16, 7S-K-70; De Cunzo and Catts, 1990).

Intensified and Durable Occupation: 1730-1770 +/-

During this period, the settlement pattern evolved to a more inland focus, reflecting the change from tobacco to grain agriculture in the early eighteenth century in southern Delaware. Lewes continued to be the major focus of the county, and was home to a salt works and a shipbuilding industry, but crossroads villages began to appear as timber clearing and the development of arable lands farther from the coast spurred inland settlement (Custer & Catts, p. 35, 49). After the inland region commenced development, coastal transportation routes gained prominence. Dependence upon the sea for trade and the land for lumber caused the social system of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred to develop similarly to that of southern plantation systems. Major landowners who held choice tracts

of land occupied the highest rung of the social and economic ladder, while lesser landowners, foresters and shippers were in the middle, and tenants, day laborers, and slaves had the least status (Herman, p. 66). In addition, the population increased during this period, as immigrants arrived in the area, both migrating from the Eastern Shore and coming from overseas (Custer & Catts, p. 35).

More permanent architecture began to be seen during this time period, due in part to the resolution of the border dispute. The Georgian style began to be seen, as did more permanent construction. Timber frame was still the general method of construction, and brick buildings were rare. Agricultural buildings of the period would also reflect the changes in farming, with frame barns, granaries, and corn cribs in addition to buildings to house livestock (Custer & Catts, p. 36, 51).

More research is needed to ascertain the agricultural patterns, material culture, education, and changing demographics of this region during this era, and how natural features influenced settlement patterns.

Because few structures and buildings constructed during this era were impermanent in nature, and other factors such as development, road re-alignments, hurricanes, neglect and infill led to their destruction, it is not anticipated that any property types will be found from the era of Intensified and Durable Occupation in the Route 24 Love Creek to Route 1 APE.

Early Industrialization: 1770-1830 +/-

Lewes remained the Sussex County seat until January 29, 1791 when Rhodes Shankland, George Mitchell and others formally moved the county seat to the site of Old John Pettijohn's Field. This area was later renamed Georgetown after George Mitchell, and remains the seat of government for Sussex County today (http://www.co.sussex.de.us/historical/index.html).

By the dawn of the nineteenth century, much of the land used for crops, such as Indian corn, was exhausted. Farms of this period averaged less than 200 acres, and contained few, if any, outbuildings. As farmers cleared new land, they typically constructed small "log or frame dwellings of one and one-half stories and enclosing an average of less than 450 square feet of living space" (DeCunzo & Garcia, p. 22). Small apple and peach orchards, along with cows, sheep, hogs, and oxen helped supplement rural family income (DeCunzo & Garcia, p. 22). Many local residents living closer to coastal environs relied on the wealth of shellfish and oysters to augment low crop yields from depleted fields (Collins & Eby, p. 205).

Settlers during this period relied heavily on timbering efforts, and a self-sufficient economy gave way to greater reliance on crafting industries and coastal trade networks. The iron industry also grew in the region at this time; iron companies were established in the second half of the eighteenth century. These companies took up large tracts of forest and swamp and needed a great deal of charcoal and wood to operate. However, the iron

industry in the Nanticoke watershed also declined in economic importance during this period as lands were sold off and farmed or timbered (Custer & Catts, p. 36, 39).

Among these early forest plantations, the most common outbuildings were corncribs or small barns (Herman, pp. 105-106). Corncribs were also commonly called "stacks" in rural Sussex County, attesting to the mobility of these structures (Herman, p. 192). Typically, extant corncribs of this era are of log construction "raised on wood or masonry blocks, and covered with shallowly pitched gable roofs" (Herman, p. 107). Farmers are thought to have shared these corn storage facilities, but little written evidence or material documentation remains (Quinn, p. 85). Barns constructed during this time were usually 15 or 16 feet by 20 feet, "one story high, built of wood, covered with a gable roof over a floored loft, and often enlarged with lean-tos" (Herman, p. 107). Very few of these resources remain intact today, and none are found within the project area along Route 24. Existing corn houses, corncribs, or small barns constructed during this period (Early Industrialization: 1770-1830 +/-) would be potentially eligible resources for the *National Register of Historic Places* under both Criterion A: broad patterns of historical significance of farming, and Criterion C: architectural significance of the corn house/crib and small barn type, or might be potentially eligible as a component of an agricultural complex (See Judith Quinn & Bernard Herman's *National Register of Historic Places: Eligible Sites in Little Creek and Broad Creek Hundreds, Sussex County, Delaware* nomination for other eligible corn house types within southern Delaware and Bernard Herman's *The Stolen House*, Chapter Three, "Unfit for Tillage").

Although slave ownership among residents declined (due in part to the Anti-Slave Trade Act of 1807, effective January 1, 1808, outlawing the importation of new slaves into the United States), the proportion of African-Americans who were slaves versus those who were free was substantially higher in Sussex County than in the rest of the county and state (http://www.lexisnexis.com/academic/guides/african_american/slavetrade.htm). In 1810 there were 2,401 slaves living in Sussex County, and 4,177 total slaves in the state (Collins & Eby, p. 205). Topics such as retailing operations, patterns of slave work and leisure, as well as communal organization all need to be investigated for Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred during this period.

Prior to the Second Great Awakening during the early nineteenth century, most inhabitants of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred were Anglicans. As a result of uncertain state boundaries, many citizens traveled to Maryland and remained members of Maryland parishes until the turn of the nineteenth century; however, Methodism challenged the primacy of the Anglican Church in Sussex County. By 1775, one estimate calculated that of the "3,148 Methodists and 19 preachers in America – 40% of them were found on the Delmarva Peninsula" (Quinn, p. 119). Local camp revival meetings bolstered Methodist membership. These gatherings, led by itinerant Methodist preachers, contributed to the Methodist church membership enrollment rising 120% between 1800 (8,705) and 1805 (18,985) (Quinn, p. 120). What little formal education peninsula inhabitants received usually came through these churches and preachers (Collins & Eby, p. 204). More intensive research needs to be conducted into the presence of camp meeting sites and the effect of Methodism in the vicinity of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred as has been done

with Little Creek and Broad Creek Hundreds (See Judith Quinn and Bernard L. Herman's *National Register of Historic Places: Eligible Sites in Little Creek and Broad Creek Hundreds, Sussex County, Delaware*).

Industrialization and Early Urbanization: 1830-1880 +/-

Settlement during the early-mid nineteenth century mimicked earlier colonial patterns. People preferred to live in non-nucleated patterns away from previously established communities. The arrival of the railroad through Sussex County in the 1850s and 1860s, however, forever altered these settlement patterns. The Delaware Railroad, which pushed south to Delmar in 1859, helped connect Sussex County to northern urban communities (Williams, pp. 1-2). The Junction and Breakwater Railroad was completed to Lewes in 1869. Small towns or cross roads proliferated in response to these rail lines. Althouth these new railroad lines were an improvement over the existing roads, the rail lines did not bring immediate local prosperity (Carter, p. 8). Instead, these railroads helped to slowly transform the nature of commerce and transportation throughout the Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred area over time (Carter, p. 8).

One of the emergent property types along the Route 24 corridor that typically dates to the period of Industrialization and Early Urbanization is the Agricultural Complex.[1] An Agricultural Complex is composed of a farmstead with one or more dwellings on the property, along with yards, gardens, fences, ditches, wells, and other standing "domestic and agricultural outbuildings" (De Cunzo & Garcia, pp. 234-5). Most Agricultural Complexes from this time period featured vernacular I-house dwellings that the farm owner is presumed to have lived in (*See the discussion which follows concerning I-houses*). Other dwellings such as tenant houses or farm manager houses may have been located on the property which date to this time period, but most are anticipated to have been razed, moved, or deteriorated (De Cunzo & Garcia, p. 235). Domestic and agricultural outbuildings such as corn stacks (houses), small barns, sheds, granaries, hay poles, and root houses are also expected features of intact nineteenth century Agricultural Complexes – however, due to their often impermanent nature, weather events, and changes in agricultural technology, few are expected to have survived into the twenty-first century. According to De Cunzo and Garcia, "utilitarian and nonutilitarian spaces and features directly associated with these buildings—landscaped lawns, yards, and gardens; kitchen gardens; work yards; animal pens; wells and other water sources; drives,

[1] The following discussion of the Agricultural Complex property type is derived from Lu Ann De Cunzo and Ann Marie Garcia's October 1992 *Historic Context: The Archaeology of Agriculture and Rural Life, New Castle and Kent Counties, Delaware, 1830-1940*; this same definition of an Agricultural Complex was used again by De Cunzo & Garcia in their August 1993 report *"Neither a Desert Nor A Paradise;" Historic Context For The Archaeology Of Agriculture And Rural Life, Sussex County, Delaware, 1770-1940*. While the original context focused on the northern two-thirds of Delaware, the "social and cultural aspects of farm life" as developed in the report can be refined with modification to Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred, Sussex County, Delaware area (De Cunzo & Garcia, p. i). In addition, John Bedell's *Historic Context: The Archaeology of Farm and Rural Dwelling Sites in New Castle and Kent Counties, Delaware 1730-1770 and 1770-1830* (2002) also helped inform, to a lesser degree, the definition of an Agricultural Complex within this report. Meetings with McCormick Taylor, DelDOT, and the Delaware SHPO in December 2002 and May 2003 encouraged a focus on the evaluation of agricultural resources functionally, rather than stylistically.

lanes, and paths; trash and other waste disposal area and features" are all key features spatially to the farmstead plan of Agricultural Complexes (De Cunzo & Garcia, p. 235). Agricultural fields, wood lots, marshes, ditches, streams, and orchards are all important natural features of Agricultural Complexes as well, which contribute to the overall setting and feeling of a property (De Cunzo & Garcia, p. 235). Agricultural Complexes derive their primary definition and meaning from the function and activities that took place or continue to take place on them; the style and integrity of the dwellings and supporting domestic and agricultural outbuildings play a lesser role in assessing the eligibility of an Agricultural Complex.[2] "Comparative information" is also important to consider when evaluating all property and usage types within this Historic Context for the Route 24 Project (National Register Bulletin: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, p. 47). If an Agricultural Complex (or any other property type) is a "rare surviving example of its type" that may "justify accepting a greater degree of alteration or fewer features" (provided that "enough of the property survives for it to be a significant resource"), then that resource may be considered eligible because it may be one of a few examples that is able to "convey its historic character or information" along the Route 24 corridor in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred (National Register Bulletin: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, p. 47).

Physical characteristics are therefore only a part of the entire Agricultural Complex. "Associative characteristics," such as documentary research, tax assessment records, probate and Orphans' Court records, deeds, wills, maps and atlases, oral histories, and published and unpublished primary history sources are also needed to substantiate the significance of Agricultural Complexes (De Cunzo and Garcia, p. 236). These sources are vital to document the agricultural production of significant Agricultural Complexes under Criterion A: "association with one or more events important in the defined historic context" (National Register Bulletin: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, p. 12). If an Agricultural Complex meets all the above criteria, and is able to effectively and completely convey association "with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history," then it may be eligible for listing in the *National Register of Historic Places* as an Agricultural Complex under Criterion A (National Register Bulletin: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, p. 12).[3] In cases where the integrity of the entire Agricultural Complex has been compromised due to demolition, infill, development, individual components of the Complex – such as the main farm house – Agricultural Complexes maybe be eligible for individual listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C if the building or structure represents "the work of a master," "posseses high artistic value," "embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction" or which represents "a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack

[2] As noted earlier, this idea to evaluate the National Register eligibility of Agricultural Complexes is derived from email from Gwenyth Davis to Mike Hahn dated March 27, 2003 (as forwarded to Jennifer Horner on March 31, 2003) "Re: SR 26 Planning Study – CRS comments."

[3] As De Cunzo and Garcia noted, Agricultural Complexes typically evolved over time, and changed with the needs of the occupants and agricultural technology; therefore, Agricultural Complexes will continue to be a defining property type for the period of Urbanization and Early Suburbanization: 1880-1940 +/- that follows.

individual distinction" (National Register Bulletin: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, p. 17).

The arrival of the railroad during the period of Industrialization and Early Urbanization helped continue what came to be known as the I-house form in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred.[4] I-houses are usually found on Agricultural Complexes, are two and one-half stories in height, one or two rooms deep, three, four, or five bays in width, and feature a side-gable roofline. While the I-house existed in pre-railroad America, especially in regions of the Tidewater South where traditional British folk forms persisted, rail lines helped provide cheap, plentiful lumber to areas once limited by water transportation routes, which helped continue the popularity of the familiar, side-gable house form (McAlester, p. 96). The Hart Property (S-1003) is an example of an I-house with remaining outbuildings along the Route 24 corridor between Love Creek and Route 1.

Railroads also helped disseminate changing stylistic trends and urban news to the rural inhabitants of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred. Affluent local farmers could now add stylistic details to make their simple, side-gabled dwellings appear fashionable, as they were no longer restricted exclusively to local building materials and customs (McAlester, pp. 96, 89). Existing I-houses were altered during the post-railroad era to include front and side porches, chimneys, and rearward ell extensions, and vernacular Gothic Revival and Italianate details as their owners saw fit (McAlester, p. 96). Some earlier side-gable houses featured Greek Revival style elements, such as a lower-pitched gable roofline, with wide cornice lines with boxed returns and six-pane glazed windows, while other later dwellings exhibited hints of Italianate influences with slightly overhanging eaves supported by decorative brackets, and single, tall, narrow, arched windows (McAlester, p. 178, 210). In rural areas, architectural styles such as vernacular Greek Revival, Italianate and Gothic Revival continued long past their popularity in urban centers. Local residents opted to selectively adapt elements from popular styles in their own vernacular housing forms long after they were out of vogue in cities. Defining characteristics of two and one-half story, single and double pile, side-gabled houses built after the railroad arrived in Sussex County include dwellings that are two and one-half stories in height, three-to-five bays in width, and one or two rooms deep, typically with a center stair or passage (Bucher, p. 244).

Potentially eligible I-house resources may exhibit original two-over-two or six-over-six wood frame windows, wood shake or clapboard exterior siding, brick interior or exterior corbelled chimneys, and side-gable frame roofs.[5] Eligible I-houses may have exterior side or front porches or rear or side ell additions, depending upon their original form and function and evolving usage over time. Screened-in porches are acceptable on I-houses; however, infilled porches that date after the Period of Significance may potentially render

[4] Note: the term "I-house" will be used interchangeably with the two and one-half story, three, four or five bay, side-gable building form in the discussion which follows. Virginia & Lee McAlester's *A Field Guide to American Houses* (2000) section on "Folk Houses – National" (pages 88-101) helped provide a description of I-houses which will be used to assess National Register eligibility along the Route 24 APE.

[5] I-houses are also found with other forms of architectural detailing, such as Italianate or Gothic Revival elements.

a resource ineligible. Vinyl or aluminum exterior siding is acceptable, provided that the original exterior materials remain beneath. Replacement windows are acceptable, too, if the building retains its original fenestration. A two and one-half story, three to five bay, single or double pile side-gable house should also ideally exhibit integrity of location, setting, design, feeling, association, materials and workmanship to be considered individually eligible for the *National Register of Historic Places.* Unsympathetic additions that obscure the original side-gable I-house form, exterior alterations, changes in historical acreage, and visual intrusions caused by new development could potentially render an I-house of this time period an ineligible resource. Physical features of an I-house "must be visible enough to convey [their] significance" – even if "a property is physically intact, its integrity is questionable if its significant features are concealed under modern construction" (National Register Bulletin: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, p. 46). Two and one-half story side-gable dwellings along the Route 24 vicinity from Love Creek to Route 1 are frequently a component of a larger Agricultural Complex, and as such, should also retain significance as an intact part of a farmstead. In this instance, side-gabled, two and one-half story houses may be considered a significant component of an Agricultural Complex, reflective of local trends in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred agriculture, such as corn farming (Sheppard et al., p. iv-vi). Side-gable I-house buildings that retain integrity and are a part of a significant agricultural complex meeting the above criteria would be eligible for nomination to the *National Register of Historic Places* under Criterion A: broad patterns of history/railroad development/Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred agriculture, and/or Criterion C: architectural types/vernacular side-gable, two and one-half story (I-house) form.

The conclusion of the Civil War heralded the expansion of peach orchards in southern Delaware, and strawberries were grown in large quantities in Sussex County by the 1870s (Collins & Eby, p. 207). Limited by reliance on animal power, a scarcity of navigable inland water routes, and little available capital, farming efforts languished in comparison to enterprises in New Castle County, Delaware.

The canning industry started in the Delmarva region around 1840 (Doerrfeld, p. 1). Initially, the canning of fruits such as peaches dominated the fledgling industry. By the 1870s and 1880s, the advent of new technology such as large pressure cookers (retorts), coupled with the mechanized harvest of crops, led to a boom of diversification in the canning industry (Doerrfeld, p. 11). While canning enterprises temporarily benefited the economy, "cannery operations exploited regional labor sources, established a monopolistic control over agricultural producers, and closed plants as soon as profits declined" (Doerrfeld, p. 1). Canneries were significant because they provided jobs for "many out-of-work farm laborers and their families,"; however, they did little to stimulate "community development" (De Cunzo & Garcia, p. 27). Canneries significantly altered the structure of Delaware's agricultural economy, controlling almost a tenth of the state's productive farmland and the lives of thousands of workers (Doerrfeld, p. 1). In 1890 alone, almost 6,000 acres of land in Sussex County were devoted strictly to cultivating tomatoes (Hancock, p. 100).

More intensive research needs to be undertaken to determine the degree to which canneries impacted the lives and structures owned by Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred residents, and why, as De Cunzo and Garcia state, canneries did not "stimulate community development" (De Cunzo & Garcia, p. 27).

Milling operations were important to Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred inhabitants. Throughout the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, gristmills in the area "were essential to (an economic) system that emphasized corn production" (Bodo & Geurrant, Section 8, page 6). Early gristmills were designed to grind corn meal for local residents. During the Civil War, local farmers benefited from high grain prices (De Cunzo & Garcia, p. 30). By the mid-to-late nineteenth century, these small local mills went out of business due to competition from large steam-powered mills in burgeoning railroad hubs such as Frankford, and the large-scale, mid-western production of grain (Bodo & Geurrant, Section 8, page 6).

In southeastern Sussex County, forests were composed primarily of soft pine tree varieties (Kalkstein, p. 125). Pine trees flourished in the sandy coastal regions, displacing other hardwood species in the lower canopy (Kalkstein, p. 125). Fast-growing pine trees like *Pinus taeda* supplied hundreds of thousands of yards of merchantable lumber annually for mills (Kalkstein, p. 126). Bald cypress trees were also found in the great Cypress Swamp, as were red maples, which provided necessary hardwood for regional consumption (Kalkstein, pp. 120-121). The extension of the Delaware Railroad in 1868 and the Junction and Breakwater Railroad line in 1869 (these two lines later combined into the Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia Railroad in 1883) encouraged mills and lumber production.

The completion of the Junction and Breakwater railroad line to Lewes and the "Iron Pier" built on Lewes Beach in 1870 transformed Lewes into an important connection between southern Delaware and eastern inland ports. The maritime tradition continued with the construction of the Maritime Exchange and the Marine Signal Station on the Delaware Breakwater and the life-saving station at Cape Henlopen in 1882. In addition, the completion of the Queen Anne Railroad in 1898 was a spur for a second boom period in Lewes in the 1890s (*Victorian Lewes and Its Architecture,* pp. 3-4).

More research needs to be conducted to determine the effect of the shipbuilding and timbering industries upon the architecture of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred residences and related agricultural outbuildings.

Urbanization and Early Suburbanization: 1880-1940 +/-

Even throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, inhabitants in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred clung to historic settlement patterns and gravitated toward rural, agricultural pursuits. Many locals kept one foot "firmly planted in the eighteenth century" as conservative attitudes and agricultural practices persisted in southeastern Delaware well into the twentieth century (Williams, p. 95). The one limited exception to this pattern occurred as communities grew around transportation routes, forming small, linear

roadside towns. The advent and affordability of the automobile, coupled with an improved highway system, prompted the development of truck farming. Paved roadways facilitated the timely transport of perishable fruits such as strawberries to urban markets, along with poultry. Ultimately the development of the commercial broiler industry proved to be "one of the most significant events in the evolution of Delaware commercial agriculture" that helped replace waning maritime interests (Lanier & Herman, p. 238-239).

Delaware was centrally located in what was known as the "Middle Atlantic Trucking Region" during the 1920s (Doerrfeld, p. 11). In excess of 900 miles long, this region extended from the coast of Maine southward to the Low Country of South Carolina (Doerrfeld, p. 11). Averaging only 50 miles in width, this truck farming corridor owed its existence to three factors: the string of large cities and towns situated on the east coast which served as ready markets, soils ideally suited for the cultivation of fruits and vegetables, and the "mild, semi-marine climate, having long frost-free seasons" due to the regulating effects of the Atlantic Ocean (Doerrfield, p. 11). In 1924, the du Pont Highway (or U.S. Route 13 and U.S. Route 113) was constructed; this roadway functioned as a vital north-south transportation artery for the state and further enhanced Delaware's truck farming economy (Williams, p. 112; Federal Writers' Project, p. 81). As Coleman du Pont's desire for a "road of the future" matured into fruition, and the State Highway Department was established by a 1917 session of the Legislature, the state of Delaware was positioned for commercial growth (Federal Writers' Project, pp. 80-81). By c.1920, improved roadways meant that strawberries could be picked "in the early morning, loaded into crates and packed for market by midday and be in Philadelphia and New York by evening, there to be sent to retail stores in time for the next morning's contingent of shoppers" (Collins & Eby, p. 207). Crops such as strawberries, apples, sweet potatoes, corn, and tomatoes were grown in southeastern Delaware, but peaches, which had been a boon to many Sussex County farmers in the 1860s, were decimated by disease in the early 1890s (Doerrfeld, p. 11). During the 1890s, the canning industry likewise shifted focus away from peaches to the canning of tomatoes, corn and peas (Doerrfeld, p. 11). The invention of the sanitary can and associated processing equipment rendered the hand-made can of the nineteenth century obsolete (Doerrfeld, p. 11). By the 1940s, the advent of frozen foods supplanted the popularity of canned goods, and many canneries heeded the capitalist imperative and closed by the end of World War II when profits evaporated (Doerrfeld, p. 1).

Railroad lines passing through the region to the west, coupled with the expansion of paved highways in the twentieth century also promoted growth of the egg and poultry industries (Collins & Eby, p. 207).[6] Although many local farmers had previously been engaged in egg production, it suddenly became profitable to raise and dress broiler chickens for delivery to New York City and Philadelphia. Broiler chicken production

[6] Before 1917, Sussex County in total had less than 35 miles of paved roadway. By 1924, Coleman du Pont's "revolutionary concrete highway" – Route 113 – ran the entire length of the state of Delaware and "provided new economic opportunities," especially for farmers (De Cunzo & Garcia, p. 31). See Lu Ann De Cunzo & Ann Marie Garcia's *"Neither A Desert Nor A Paradise:" Historic Context For The Archaeology of Agriculture And Rural Life, Sussex County, Delaware, 1770-1940* (August 1993).

rose to unprecedented levels during this time period, and was a savior for the local and state economy during the Great Depression of the 1930s. The move to broilers also meant a decrease in truck farming in many areas, and the decreased profitability of canning operations in the region (Williams, p. 122). Not only had a fungus disease ravaged many important income-producing truck crops such as strawberries and tomatoes c.1920, but a drop in the salinity levels of the Indian River Bay decimated the bay's shellfish population (Krajewski, p. 3).

The rapidly increasing demand for chickens meant that many relatively poor farmers could get rich virtually overnight (Williams, p. 122). The broiler chicken industry flourished in Sussex County for a variety of reasons, chief among which were the temperate climate, cheap building, labor, and overhead costs (especially for heating fuel), readily available credit for financing, close proximity to markets, and a porous soil which provided for good drainage and aided in disease control (Tomhave, p. 131). Although the average farm size declined in Sussex County (from an average of 123 acres in 1880 to an average of 78 acres in 1930) along with the percentage of land used for farming activities, many farmers were able to take advantage of agricultural and technological changes and increase their own revenues (Callahan, n.p.; Lanier & Herman, p. 7). Tenant farming increased during this period as well, with "over 50% of Delaware's farmers being tenants or sharecroppers" around 1900 (De Cunzo & Garcia, p. 31). High levels of farm tenancy continued throughout the region well into the twentieth century (De Cunzo & Garcia, p. 31). With this monetary windfall, many larger Sussex County farmers constructed new family farmhouses and agricultural outbuildings, altered their existing homes, or moved older housing stock to their properties for tenant residences.

Existing Agricultural Complexes from the period of Industrialization and Early Urbanization 1830-1880 +/- were modified as a result of the exploding broiler industry during the time of Urbanization and Early Suburbanization (1880 – 1940 +/-) along the Route 24 corridor. Pre- and post-railroad I-houses typically underwent modifications in the twentieth century; some older housing was torn-down to make way for newer housing forms such as bungalows after the turn of the twentieth century (*See discussion of the bungalow type which follows).* A wide variety of extant agricultural outbuildings helps contribute to the overall significance of an Agricultural Complex, illustrates changing farming practices over time, and serves as a tangible reminder of the many different agricultural pursuits in which the Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred farmers were engaged. The presence of newer agricultural outbuildings does not necessarily hurt the overall integrity of an Agricultural Complex, provided that other structures are found intact on the property that date to the Period of Significance of the overall complex. Adapting the criteria first used in August 1998 by the Center for Historic Architecture and Design (CHAD) at the University of Delaware for their evaluation of farm complexes for the Delaware Agricultural Lands Preservation Foundation (DALPF), as well as using the Agricultural Complex property type first developed in De Cunzo and Garcia's *Historic Context: The Archaeology of Agriculture and Rural Life, New Castle and Kent Counties, Delaware 1830-1940,* Agricultural Complexes found along the Route 24 project area potentially eligible for the *National Register of Historic Places* should retain both

integrity and significance as a farmstead.[7] Broadly, farmhouses should retain integrity of materials, design, feeling and workmanship, and should exhibit their original building form, in spite of modern additions or alterations (Sheppard, et al., p. v). Intact Agricultural Complexes achieve significance under Criterion A for their ability to convey information or exhibit trends concerning Delaware's agricultural development. For the purposes of this evaluation, Agricultural Complexes along the Route 24 APE merit consideration under Criterion A: agricultural trends and/or Criterion C: architectural significance if the original fenestration and massing of a farmhouse remains, the positioning of agricultural structures in relation to the farmhouse is intact, open space around the farm is seen, or is currently being used for cultivation, and if the complex is able to sufficiently convey a sense and feeling of the "full landscape" of a significant agricultural pursuit as discussed in this context (such as corn or strawberry farming, or the broiler industry) (Siders, et al., p. 11, 21, 30-31). To be recommended eligible under Criterion A, an Agricultural Complex needs to exhibit a relationship between agricultural structures and buildings that adds something new or significant to the historic context of agricultural development to Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred, Sussex County, the State of Delaware, or to national agricultural trends within its Period of Significance as a farmstead. If a particular property lacks overall significance and integrity as a farmstead, individual property types may be eligible for inclusion separately in the *National Register of Historic Places* (*See the following discussion of individual agricultural property types*).[8]

Residential architectural property types associated with the period of Urbanization and Early Suburbanization (1880-1940 +/-) include Colonial Revival and bungalow houses. Since the farm economy of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred was transformed from one of corn/subsistence farming to poultry and truck farming in the twentieth century, housing styles likewise evolved to respond to the changing nature and affluence of farmers. In addition, the development of the beach communities caused changes in residential architecture.

Over time, houses grew in size due to prosperity from the cultivation of poultry, egg and strawberries; this also prompted many farmers to alter their existing side-gable farmhouses. Some property owners added porches, decorative exterior details, or replaced windows. Others purchased new household items made possible by the introduction of electricity through the region after WWI.

More research needs to be done to investigate the types of items these consumers were purchasing, and where these items were being purchased during this period of Urbanization and Early Suburbanization.

---

[7] Please reference the earlier discussion of Agricultural Complexes during the period of Industrialization and early Urbanization: 1830 – 1880 +/- for additional information.

[8] The following agricultural property types are defined primarily on the basis of their architectural form rather than usage. This discussion was included for instances where a particular Agricultural Complex may not be eligible, but individual structures may be individually exceptional, and therefore should be considered for listing in the National Register under Criterion C.

Dwelling property types found frequently in Sussex County include Colonial Revival-style, single-family residences.[9] With accentuated front façade entries with pediments supported by pilasters or simple wood columns, sometimes surrounded by fanlights or sidelights, these dwellings have a decidedly balanced feel. Typically three, five, or seven bays in width, and two bays in depth, Colonial Revival houses with wood frame, double-hung sash windows with single and paired multi-pane glazing are the best representative examples of their type (McAlester, p. 321). Hipped roof, four-square examples of Colonial Revival style residences with full-width front porches were popular forms from c.1895 through 1920, while side-gable types with simple accent details reigned from c.1905 until 1940 (McAlester, p. 325). Most of these vernacular forms of Colonial Revival style houses had either wood shingle siding, wood clapboard siding, or if the interpretation was executed in a high-style form, masonry.

Early examples of Colonial Revival architecture had exaggerated elements of Georgian and Adam styles; by 1915, the *White Pine Series of Architectural Monographs* had encouraged builders to take a more sympathetic, restrained approach (McAlester, p. 326). Later examples of the Colonial Revival style were influenced by the Great Depression of the 1930s, and World War II – these events prompted a further simplification of side-gable building styles with simple architectural details, suggesting their "colonial precedents rather than closely mirroring them" (McAlester, p. 326). It should also be noted that many I-house property types sustained Colonial Revival exterior additions during the period of Urbanization and Early Suburbanization to make them appear more fashionable. Frequently, nineteenth century I-houses had small decorative porches added to their front entries, supported by slender columns, or sidelights added; often, older I-houses sustained changes in fenestration, or had decorative shutters added.

Potentially eligible examples of Colonial Revival architecture to the *National Register of Historic Places* should have integrity of location, setting, design, feeling, association, materials and workmanship, without significant unsympathetic twentieth or twenty-first century additions that obscure their original form and function. Porches may be screened in, but infilled porches or bays are usually unacceptable for eligibility. Earlier examples of Colonial Revival architecture should have a hipped roof, preferably with an intact, full-width front wood porch and four-square massing; later examples of this type should show more restrained features and a side-gable roof. It is anticipated that most Colonial Revival dwellings are either one and one-half stories, or two and one-half stories in height; eligible examples of the Colonial Revival building type should retain their original fenestration and positioning of doors if they do not have their original windows or doors. Properties that individually exhibit the above characteristics would be potentially eligible for consideration for the *National Register of Historic Places* under Criterion C: architectural significance/vernacular Colonial Revival style; or if part of an Agricultural Complex eligible for consideration under Criterion A: Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred agricultural trends/practices.

---

[9] This discussion which follows concerning the Colonial Revival property type is derived from a definition from Virginia & Lee McAlester's *A Field Guide to American Houses* (2000) chapter on "Eclectic Houses – Colonial Revival 1880-1955" pp. 321-341.

Although the Colonial Revival dwelling is a common property type occurring in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred both as part of Agricultural Complexes or as single-family dwellings and some buildings along the Route 24 corridor within the APE show some Colonial Revival influences, no high style examples were found along the Route 24 APE from Love Creek to Route 1.

Another anticipated building type along the Route 24 corridor is the bungalow. According to the thematic *National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form* completed in July 1990 by Susan Mulchahey, et al., all of those representative bungalow houses located in Sussex County, Delaware which were built between 1880 and 1940 which exhibit the physical attributes of form, construction, interior finishes and siting (*See below details*), as well as those dwellings free from significant alteration, are potentially eligible resources for listing in the *National Register of Historic Places* under Criterion C: architectural significance of rural bungalow forms (Mulchahey, p. 22). For the purposes of the Route 24 Project, this thematic nomination will not apply, given the fact that interior views are necessary to assess eligibility of bungalows under the Mulchahey National Register Nomination. Therefore, using Alan Gowans' text, *The Comfortable House: North American Suburban Architecture 1890-1930*, a new bungalow property type will be developed and followed for the Route 24 APE to assess potential eligibility.[10]

As a building type, the bungalow was a relative unknown on the American landscape prior to 1900. By c.1910, however, cities, suburbs, and countrysides were dotted with the new "quintessentially American creation[s]" – the bungalow (Gowans, p. 74). Although some assert that the bungalow was first "invented" by the firm of Charles and Henry Greene c.1903, it is likely that no one group or architect can claim "paternity" of the bungalow (Gowans, p. 74). Debate also centers on how the bungalow is defined as a housing form. Frequently, the term "bungalow" is used as a synonym for "'home' and symbol of 'naturalism' or 'Americanism'" (Gowans, p. 75). Because bungalows were thought of as being particularly "American" in style, they can be found with "Colonial, Classical, Shingle, [and] Spanish" influences, as well as regional vernacular variations (Gowans, p. 75).[11] Prototype bungalows tend to have a "roof sweeping over a verandah or porch" (Gowans, p. 77). The bungalow form also tends to be one or one and one-half stories in height; if a bungalow does have a second floor, it is usually characterized by a shed or gable-roof dormer (Gowans, p. 77). Thanks to improved transportation networks

[10] Based on meetings and consultation between the Delaware SHPO, DelDOT and MTA in December 2002 and May 2003, the bungalow context which follows was developed primarily by using Alan Gowans' definition of a "bungalow" dwelling found in his text, *The Comfortable House: North American Suburban Architecture 1890-1930* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986). Other sources, such as Poppeliers, et al. *What Style Is It? A Guide to American Architecture* (Washington, D.C.: The Preservation Press, 1983), and Virginia & Lee McAlester's *A Field Guide to American Houses* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 2000) were also consulted, albeit to a lesser degree than Gowan. Details will be given first about Susan Mulchahey's bungalow context before moving on and developing a new bungalow context.

[11] Despite the fact that many post-Victorian writers identified the bungalow as being an "American" form, bungalows are actually thought to have their origin in British Bengal, derived from the name *bangala*, meaning "typical native dwelling" (Gowans, p. 76). Bungalows appear to have been transplanted from the "British Raj to Britain, Canada, and the United States almost simultaneously, around 1880" (Gowans, p. 76).

by the twentieth century, bungalows were often procured via mail-order catalogs, and constructed of "precut lumber, nails, doors and other components shipped to the site" (Poppeliers, *et al.*, p. 77). Bungalows in Sussex County may have been originally sheathed in wood shingles, given the fact that cypress and other wood shingles were produced locally in the Cypress Swamp. "Rafter, ridge beams and purlins" typically extend beyond the wall and roof junction in bungalows, and windows are anticipated to be "sash or casement with many lights or single panes of glass" which can be found singularly, paired, or grouped (Blumenson, p. 71).

Searching for the latest in building styles for their own dwellings, many Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred residents also began to design and construct new suburban dwellings for their rural environment during the early twentieth century.[12] Because urban plans and designs were accessible through mail-order catalogues, residents could select the latest styles available from pre-fabricated homes from companies such as Sears, Roebuck and Company and have them delivered by railroad lines (Callahan, n.p.). The bungalow style house in particular was a thrifty and easy to build design that appealed to people in both rural and urban communities (Mulchahey, p. 2). These bungalows integrated "high-style suburban architecture with traditional rural forms" (Mulchahey, p. 2). While urban examples of bungalows had built-in furniture such as cupboards, buffets, bookcases and window seats, as well as fireplaces, rural bungalow examples found in Baltimore Hundred often lacked these interior features according to Susan Mulchahey (Mulchahey, p. 17). Although some rural bungalows were sited so as to appear "part of a suburb," perched on small lots near the side of a road with sidewalks "leading to the front doors and hedges marking out the yards," they were usually a part of a larger Agricultural Complex (Mulchahey, p. 17-18). Inside, many of these rural bungalows had a modified floor plan. Rather than featuring separate, distinct kitchen, dining, entertaining, sleeping, or library areas, rural bungalows possessed a traditional hall-and-parlor floor plan. While the rural bungalow frequently featured a cypress shingle exterior, a low-pitched roof terminating in deep, overhung eaves supported by simple brackets on a full-width front porch, "the owners stopped short of fully transforming the interior space" (Mulchahey, p. 19). In essence, these bungalows, like other buildings, "outwardly adopt [ed] a suburban form" while the residents inside clung to their localized, familiar floor plans (Mulchahey, p. 19). S-10115 is an example of the bungalow form along the Route 24 corridor from Love Creek to Route 1.

Potentially eligible bungalow property types within the Route 24 APE will be evaluated on the basis of the seven aspects of integrity and exterior features only. Potentially eligible bungalows are anticipated to have broad, gently pitched gables and to be one to one and one-half stories in height (usually without a full basement), with single, paired, and grouped windows.[13] Although many of the original bungalows were probably clad in

---

[12] This discussion of bungalows in Sussex County, Delaware is derived from Susan A. Mulchahey, et. al. *National Register of Historic Places Eligibility Evaluation: Baltimore Hundred, Sussex County, Delaware* (Newark, DE: Center for Historic Architecture and Engineering, July 1990).

[13] The seven aspects of integrity include location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. See pages 44-45 of the National Register Bulletin: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.*

local materials (such as cypress shingles), replacement siding over original covering may be acceptable, if the building maintains its original design, materials, workmanship and bungalow massing. Open or enclosed front and rear porches are integral components of a bungalow, and as such, a potentially eligible bungalow should possess its original porches. These porches may be enclosed; however, infilled porches are usually not acceptable because they detract from the original bungalow form and design. Wide roof overhangs with exposed details such as rafter tails and knee-bracing may be seen in high-style bungalows; vernacular variations may also be seen (such as shallow roof overhangs). Nationally, bungalows declined in popularity after the mid-1920s, but local builders and craftspeople likely continued the form in the Route 24 area until WWII. While "consciously correct" Craftsman-style bungalows flourished in urban areas (such as Wilmington), distinctive and vernacular versions (potentially based on mail-order catalogue plans) survive in greater numbers in more rural areas (Gowans, p. 73); S-10115 is a vernacular example. Whether a "higher-style" mail-order bungalow or a more vernacular version, potentially eligible bungalows should retain integrity of their original form. Replacement windows may be seen; however, the original fenestration should remain the same for potentially eligible bungalows. By the same token, potentially eligible bungalows should retain the original placement of doors, if not the original doors themselves. The essential bungalow form should be intact on potentially eligible bungalows; for "even if a property is physically intact, its integrity is questionable if its significant features are concealed under modern construction" (National Register Bulletin: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, p. 47). Changes in use do not automatically disqualify a bungalow from eligibility; however, a potentially eligible bungalow must still retain integrity and distinctive exterior stylistic elements that distinguish the bungalow form from other dwelling types in order to be eligible under Criterion C, embodying distinctive characteristics of the bungalow architectural form.

Increasing leisure time and personal affluence, together with the expansion of paved roads and availability of the automobile, meant that summer beach resorts grew in popularity during the twentieth century. Rehoboth Beach, located north of Baltimore Hundred, was the hub of Sussex County shore development. Founded in 1872 by Methodists, who reclaimed the "sandy, scrub pine wasteland" into a camp meeting site, Rehoboth Beach even boasted a railroad line by 1878 (Williams, p. 122).

Although revival camp meetings ended at the beaches by WWI, rail lines, together with the du Pont Highway, meant that a steady stream of summer vacationers frequented the shore (Williams, p. 122). During the warmer months, mosquitoes were a major nuisance in these low, swampy environs. By the 1930s, however, the Civilian Conservation Corps drained most of these marshes and helped bring the insect problem under control (Williams, pp. 122-123). Today, one of Sussex County's largest tourist attractions is its shore destinations. Beach related industries and shore development continued to thrive once the lowlands were drained in the 1930s. After WWII, shore development spread southward from Rehoboth into Dewey, Bethany, South Bethany Beach and Fenwick Island (Williams, p. 123). Destructive coastal storms and hurricanes threaten these areas, and one particular storm in March 1962 caused seven deaths and over twenty-two million

dollars in property damage (Fleming, p. 65). Beach erosion continues to be problematic along most of Delaware's southeastern shoreline.

More intensive research is needed into the role of government and religion, as well as occupational organizations during the time of Urbanization and Early Suburbanization 1880 – 1940 +/-.

Suburbanization and Early Ex-Urbanization: 1940-1960 +/-

Following the post-World War II era, construction of relatively small, modest one or one and one-half story houses occurred along the Route 24 corridor. These houses, which will collectively be typed as Modern for the purposes of this context, were usually constructed between c.1940 through the 1970s.[14] Two of the principal subtypes of this category, seen along the Route 24 APE, are Minimal Traditional and Ranch. Because Modern houses are a relatively recent property type (which drew upon a variety of architectural styles) little has been written about them in comparison to other property types discussed in this context. Due to the number of houses along the Route 24 APE between Love Creek and Route 1that were constructed during this time, the Modern property types will be developed in the discussion which follows.

Unlike many Colonial Revival houses that preceded them, Minimal Traditional houses made little attempt to carefully copy Neoclassical or Colonial prototypes (McAlester, p. 475). Instead, Minimal Traditional houses borrowed "prominent historical details (for example, Tudor half-timbering, Georgian doorways, and Queen Anne spindlework porches) and freely adapt[ed] them to contemporary forms and materials" (McAlester, p. 475). This post-War wave of housing of "historically based styles" has essentially remained the "dominant theme in American house design" into the late twentieth century (McAlester, p. 475).

Minimal Traditional houses frequently feature Tudor-inspired details and are one story or one and one-half story in height. Minimal Traditional houses usually feature a "dominant front gable and massive chimneys, but the steep Tudor roof pitch is lowered and the façade is simplified by omitting most of the traditional detailing" (McAlester, p. 477). "Eaves and rakes are close, rather than overhanging," and have a shallow or intermediate pitched roofline with few details (McAlester, p. 478). In some examples of Minimal Traditional housing, large brick exterior chimneys are seen; most examples contain at least one front-facing projecting gable (McAlester, p. 478). Window styles varied; large single-pane or multi-pane picture windows are common, as are corner windows, and single and paired double-sash windows. Shutters are commonly applied to the exterior, and the front entry is emphasized in the design (Maxwell & Massey, p. 56). Roofs are usually clad in asphalt shingles; the exterior can feature a variety of finishes, including

[14] The term "Modern" and its definition architecturally is taken from Virginia & Lee McAlester's text *A Field Guide to American Houses* (2000). See the chapter on "American Houses Since 1940," pages 476-485 for illustrations of this property type. For the purposes of this report, only those Modern houses 50 years of age or older were evaluated under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

brick, brick veneer, wood shingles or clapboard, stone, or stone veneer (McAlester, p. 478). Minimal Traditional houses may have garages integrated into the house design, or may feature single or double detached vehicular garages. Within the project area, S-10116 and S-10117 are examples of the Minimal Traditional style.

The Ranch style originated in California in the 1930s, but gained popularity in the 1940s to the point where the style generally replaced the Minimal Traditional style by the early 1950s, and "dominated American domestic building through the '60s" (McAlester, p. 477, 479). This sprawling construction form, which frequently includes a built-in garage, was indicative of the larger lots common to suburbanization and an increasing dependence on the automobile. Ranch style houses generally are one-story structures with low-pitched roofs; most have some decorative detailing loosely based on colonial precedents such as decorative shutters or porch-roof supports, usually in iron or wood. Ribbon windows or large picture windows are common, as are partially enclosed courtyards or patios. The most common roof form for Ranch houses is hipped; cross-gabled and side-gabled examples are also seen. Both wood and brick wall cladding, or a combination of both, are used (McAlester, p. 477-479). Examples of Ranch style houses in the project area are S-10112, S-10121 and S-10122.

To be considered a potentially eligible Modern/Minimal Traditional or Ranch house for the *National Register of Historic Places*, a resource must be of exceptional integrity and significance, and be able to convey something new or significant to our understanding of tract housing, or perhaps the construction techniques of Minimal Traditional or Ranch houses. If a particular house or group of houses is associated with a local or regional historically significant event, then the resource may be eligible for listing under Criterion A. If the Modern house is associated with a particular individual or family of note, then the resource may be eligible for listing under Criterion B. A Modern dwelling may be eligible under Criterion C if it represents the work of a master or architect; is a defining example locally or state-wide of Modern/Minimal Traditional or Ranch form; represents a new or revolutionary building technique, local variation, or material; or exhibits high artistic values. It must have a high degree of integrity, original building materials, landscaping features, all of which date to the Period of Significance, and other supporting materials such as architectural, or subdivision plans, and be able to contribute something new to our understanding of post-WWII buildings. A Modern house may be eligible under Criterion D if it has the potential to yield, or has yielded, "information important in prehistory or history."[15] Additionally, a Modern house constructed in the past 50 years may be eligible under Criteria Consideration G if it has achieved significance within the last half century.[16]

The Nanticoke community in the Indian River area remains active today. The tribe owns both the Nanticoke Indian Center and the Nanticoke Indian Museum. In addition, the tribe holds an annual powwow, attended by "tribes from up and down the east coast, as

[15] See the National Register Bulletin: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, pp. 12-24.

[16] See the National Register Bulletin: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, pp. 41-43.

well as nearly 30,000 non-Indian friends." Nearly 500 Nanticoke live in Sussex County, and many tribal members live in other states (*25th Annual Nanticoke Powwow* 2002).